

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,713	01/26/2001	Ryusuke Sasaki	SIP1P041	8884
22434 75	90 04/18/2006		EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			NGUYEN, KIMBINH T	
P.O. BOX 70250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			2628	
			DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/042,713	SASAKI, RYUSUKE			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kimbinh T. Nguyen	2628			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period work. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Au	igust 2004.				
·- · ·	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan					
Disposition of Claims		÷			
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 		·			
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	· .				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 May 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	* * * *				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2628

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This action is responsive to amendment filed 05/17/04.
- 2. Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (6,320,988) in view of Ishikawa et al. (6,317,130).

Claim 1, Yamaguchi et al. discloses computer-readable recording medium for transforming a 3D object (virtual skeleton model) having parts which is determined by vertexes associated with a cluster (a group of data points (nodes) on a graph) (col. 2, lines 28-36; figs. 8, 10, 11; col. 30, lines 13-14); in each frame display period, an amount of parallel movement of the cluster according to animation data defining a movement of 3D object (col. 16, lines 28-35); calculate (the normal node movement calculation) parallel movement (two movability range limitations A and B can be used simultaneously) of the cluster and a weight predefined for vertex corresponding to the cluster, the vertexes parallel to each other (col. 29, lines 1-55; col. 30, lines 42-45). Yamaguchi provides a method transforming a skeleton model of a multiple-branching structure (a set of nodes) which correspond to the coordinates of vertexes or clusters,

Art Unit: 2628

the skeleton model ought to restricted to a boundary moves and an amount of parallel movement is calculated to reduce errors. Yamaguchi does not teach including an amount of parallel movement of the cluster in frames display periods; however, Ishikawa et al. teaches including an amount of parallel movement (rotation amount) of the cluster (polygon vertex coordinates) in frames display periods (col. 14, lines 14-29); according to the calculated amount of parallel movement, the vertexes parallel to each other in each frame display period (col. 16, lines 39-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the movement amount for causing sequentially display frame images on the scene taught by Ishikawa into the Yamaguchi's teaching for transforming the shape of a skeleton model, because it would provide a recording medium having stored thereon a software program for creation of skeleton-based 3D movable graphics images of character objects representative of human bodies, capable of permitting more natural and smooth actions thereof on a display screen (col. 2, lines 35-40).

Claim 2, Yamaguchi et al. discloses a movement of joint in a virtual skeleton (fig. 4) defining a framework of 3D object and including joints, vertexes (nodes) being associated with joints, the vertex (col. 30, lines 3-4) corresponding thereto after the parallel movement of the vertexes (col. 31, lines 13-20; col. 35, lines 13-15).

Claim 3, Yamaguchi et al. discloses determining whether an amount of parallel movement of the cluster being processed is not defined (equation is indefinite or an unknown is degenerate or in state approximating) (col. 7, lines 50-52); calculating, if it is determined that the amount of parallel movement of the cluster is not defined, the

Art Unit: 2628

amount of parallel movement of cluster having already processed and an amount of parallel movement of the cluster to be processed later (col. 28, lines 61-67); if it is determined that the amount of parallel movement of the cluster is defined, the defined amount of parallel movement of the cluster being processed (col. 31, lines 17-19; col. 35, lines 13-15).

Claims 4-7, the rationale provided in the rejections of claims 1-3 are incorporated herein.

Claims 8-10, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, Yamaguchi et al. discloses a video game program (fig. 21c);a computer storage medium (col. 2, lines 29-30).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to Applicant's Arguments, claim 1 has been modified in this Office Action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimbinh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7644. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2628

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached at (571) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 10, 2006

KIMBINH T. NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Kombones Muyen